## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24, 26-30 and 33-52 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 15-17 and 33 are amended and Claims 31 and 32 are canceled by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 18, 21, 31-38, 41-43, 48, and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Asano et al. (U.S. Patent 5,289,234, herein "Asano"); Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Asano in view of Noda et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0122677 herein "Noda"); Claims 8, 9, 44, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Asano in view of Ebata et al. (U.S. Patent 5,023,660 herein "Ebata"); Claims 10-12, 46 and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Asano in view of Kinoshita et al. (U.S. Patent 5,404,203 herein "Kinoshita"); Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Asano in view of Miyabe et al. (U.S. Patent 5,950,047 herein "Miyabe"); Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Asano in view of Ojima et al. (U.S. Publication 2004/0191663 herein "Ojima"); Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Asano in view of Ojima and Yamashiro et al. (U.S. Patent 5,328,795 herein "Yamashiro"); Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Asano in view of Ojima and Inoue et al. (Japanese Publication 2000-172015 herein "Inoue"); Claims 19, 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Asano in view of Keen (U.S. Patent 4,816,877); Claims 39 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Asano in view of Kosuge (U.S. Publication 2003/004201); Claims 49, 50, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Asano in view of Keen; Claims 23-30 were allowed; and Claims 4 and 5 were indicated as allowable if

Application No. 10/532,979 Reply to Office Action of April 25, 2007

rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 4, 5 and 23-30. Accordingly, Applicants have amended Claim 4 to place this claim in independent form including all of the features recited in base Claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph,

Claims 15-17 have been amended to more clearly indicate that it is the *developing unit* that is

configured to use the toner with the various properties recited in Claims 14-17. In other

words, the claims in question are claiming a developing unit that is configured to use this

type of toner, not the toner itself. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection

under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 18, 21, 31-38, 41-43, 48, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by <u>Asano</u>, with respect to amended independent Claims 1 and 33.

Amended Claim 1 recites, in part,

- a frame body made up of at least first and second frame bodies that are movable relative to each other to form a space in an open state and to close the space in a closed state;
- a frame body positioning member positioning the first and second frame bodies;
- a latent image bearing member, supported by the frame body, and replaceable via the space formed by the first and second frame bodies;
- a developing unit supplying a developing agent to the latent image bearing member, the developing unit configured to be replaceable in the closed state via a space different than the space formed by the first and second frame bodies and configured to be replaceable in a state where the latent image bearing member is supported by the frame body; and
- a developing position determining member, disposed at a non-overlapping position relative to the frame body positioning member, and positioning the developing unit with respect to the frame body.

Claim 33 recites similar features with regard to the replaceability in a state where the latent image bearing member is supported by the frame body.

Asano describes an image forming apparatus having a detachable imaging cartridge 10 (e.g., process cartridge) that is made of (1) a portion 102 that includes a developing device 3, 1 (2) a photosensitive drum 1 and (3) a portion 101. According to the structure of Asano, it is necessary to remove the photosensitive drum 1 in order to replace the developing device 3.

Thus, <u>Asano</u> does not describe or suggest a developing unit supplying a developing agent to the latent image bearing member, the developing unit configured to be replaceable in the closed state via a space different than the space formed by the first and second frame bodies and configured to be replaceable in a state where the latent image bearing member is supported by the frame body.

In other words, the process cartridge recited in Claim 1 includes a developing unit that supplies a developing agent to the latent image bearing member and that is configured to be replaceable even when the latent image bearing member is supported by the frame body. This feature is not described or suggested by <u>Asano</u>.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 and similarly Claim 33 patentably distinguish over <u>Asano</u>.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the further cited <u>Noda</u>, <u>Ebata</u>, <u>Kinoshita</u>, <u>Miyabe</u>, <u>Ojima</u>, <u>Yamashiro</u>, <u>Inoue</u>, <u>Keen</u> or <u>Kosuge</u> references cures the above noted deficiencies of <u>Asano</u>.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 33, and claims depending therefrom, are allowable.

Asano at Abstract and Fig. 10.

Application No. 10/532,979 Reply to Office Action of April 25, 2007

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAJER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Customer Number} \\ 22850 \end{array}$ 

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04) James J. Kulbaski Atterney of Record Registration No. 34,648

I:\ATTY\JL\271399US\271399US\_AM(6.27.2007).DOC